

Application No. 10/577,727
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2009

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing replacement sheets include changes to Figs. 1 and 2. These sheets, which include Figs. 1 and 2, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application, Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 having been amended, and Claim 8-13 having been added. Support for the present amendment is believed to be self-evident from the originally filed specification.¹ Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to; Claims 1-3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Masui (U.S. Patent No. 6,809,952); and Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Masui in view of Arisawa (U.S. Patent No. 7,016,432).

With respect to the objection to the drawings, Figs. 1 and 2 are amended to include a label of --Background Art--. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is overcome.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Masui, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Masui. Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

second transmission means for transmitting a second transmission signal to the external non-contact IC card through the first antenna while the semiconductor integrated circuit is in a wireless reader/writer mode of operation.

Masui does not disclose or suggest every element of amended Claim 1.

Masui describes security systems for use in a library or laboratory.² In these security systems, there is a gate incorporating a reader/writer and separate RFID transponders (RTAG). As shown by Figs. 1 and 9 of Masui, the RFID transponders transmit and receive

¹ See, for example, Fig. 4 and paragraphs [0040]-[0041] on pages 19-20 of the specification.

² Masui, col. 5, lines 59-62 and col. 12, lines 66-67.

signals to/from the gate when in close proximity. However, the RFID transponder does not include the claimed “second transmission means for transmitting a second transmission signal to the external non-contact IC card through the first antenna while the semiconductor inetrgrated circuit is in a wireless reader/writer mode of operation.”

The RFID transponder of Masui only transmits to the gate. There is no mode of operation of the transponder of Masui that transmits a signal to another (i.e., external) non-contact IC card. The transponders of Masui are just conventional non-contact IC cards.

The invention defined by Claim 1, on the contrary, is a semiconductor IC that functions as both a non-contact IC card and a wireless reader/writer. This dual functionality is why the invention defined by Claim 1 includes two transmission means. It is noted that both of the transmission means of Claim 1 use the same “first antenna.” No device in Masui has this dual functionality of being both an non-contact IC card and a wireless reader/writer.

Thus, the RFID transponder of Masui does not disclose or suggest the claimed “second transmission means for transmitting a second transmission signal to the non-contact IC card through the first antenna while the semiconductor inetrgrated circuit is in a wireless reader/writer mode of operation.”

Moreover, no device in Masui has both of the claimed:

first transmission means for transmitting a first transmission signal to the external wireless reader/writer through the first antenna while the semiconductor integrated circuit is in an non-contact IC card mode of operation; and

second transmission means for transmitting a second transmission signal to the external non-contact IC card through the first antenna while the semiconductor inetrgrated circuit is in a wireless reader/writer mode of operation.

In view of the above-noted distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 (and any claims dependent thereon) patentably distinguishes over Masui. Claims 7

and 8 recite feature analogous to those of Claim 1. Thus, Claims 7 and 8 patentably distinguish over Masui for at least the reasons stated for Claim 1.

Addressing each of the further rejections, each of the further rejections is also traversed by the present response as no teachings in any of the further cited references to Arisawa can overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Masui. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that those rejections be withdrawn for similar reasons as discussed above.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)
1674977_1.DOC